

1 copy per annum.	\$2 00
5 copies per annum.	10 00
10 copies per annum.	20 00
1 copy per month.	2 00
1 copy per quarter.	6 00

These figures leave but small margin of
profit over and above the actual cost of the
paper used; but, if our friends will give us
their vigorous aid, some portion of the
large sacrifice we incur will be returned
in the increase of our subscription list,
while vast good will be done to the cause
in which we are so earnestly embarked,
and to which we shall devote all the tal-
ents and all the energies we possess.

MARCH 2, 1868.

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1868.

IN another column we publish a
correct copy of the communication which
Chief Justice Chase sent to the Senate
last Wednesday. Our readers will have
marked in the report of the proceedings
of the Senate on Friday, that, after the
organization of the Senate as a court of
impeachment, the Chief Justice reaffirmed
the views affirmed in this communication,
and formally submitted to the Senate
the question of adopting or rejecting the
rules previously adopted by the Senate,
and that the court quietly adopted them;
whereby it virtually expressed its agree-
ment in the views of the Chief Justice.
So the Chief Justice carried his point.
It is very clear to us, and must be,
we think, to all men of reflection, that the
radicals of Congress, if they carry the
impeachment of President Johnson, will
impeachment nothing by it for their party.
The Democracy have certainly nothing to
lose in the next presidential election by
the outrageous views of Andrew Johnson
from the presidential office by the
radicals, and the putting in of Wade.
On the contrary, they have, we do not doubt,
much to gain. We do not believe that the
Democratic party would lose or the radical
party gain any votes at all in November
in consequence of impeachment, except
the votes of those who might be influ-
enced in their political action by the
removal of a portion or the whole
of the tens of thousands of the
present office-holders and the
appointment of others in the event of
Wade's accession to the Presidency. And
we are well convinced that the exercise
of the power of removal and appointment
would be a him source of decided weak-
ness and not of strength. We have seen
it stated, and we are confident, with
truthful, strong as his ambition is for the
Chief Magistracy, he is nervous at the
thought of all the consequences of the
responsibility which the use of the prerogative
of expulsion and patronage would
devolve upon him. Vast multitudes of
people throughout the country are al-
ready beginning to feel in various ways
preparing to besiege him in various ways
in order to secure the objects of their
greedy aspirations, and, as a large propor-
tion of the present incumbents of office
are radicals, he would have to disappoint
many as many applicants as he could
appoint.

As regard to public matters, we all
now that Congress could not move
the change it proposes. It has all passed
now, and therefore could not have any
more in consequence of changes. To be
sure Wade might and do not doubt sign
bills which Johnson vetoes, but it is no
trouble to that body to pass a bill over
Johnson's veto. The proceeding does not
require in any case more than an hour,
whereas the impeachment would require
months. Precisely the same public
measures, while this Congress exists, will
be adopted, whether Johnson or Wade
shall be President, and hence the radicals
are stupid or insane if they do not know
that they are making themselves odious
for nothing and strengthening the power
of their opponents with no conceivable
advantage to themselves.

We should regret the success of im-
peachment as a flagrant national wrong,
we should regret it as a scandal upon our
country in the eyes of mankind, we should
regret it as what might weaken and en-
danger our government by giving a mon-
strous example to posterity; but, looking
only to its effects upon the coming elec-
tion and its inevitable influence upon the
fate of the mischievous party that has
lent up to it, we should not regret it in the
least degree.

IN reply to the statement that the
radical Senators have expressed opinions
in favor of the President's impeachment
and are therefore disqualified to try him,
the radical organs say that the Democrats
have expressed opinions against his
impeachment. What, then, is the point
of the disqualification? What does that
prove, if anything, except that both are
disqualified to try him?

IF the impeachment succeeds, it will
injure the radical party, and de-
cidedly more in the event of success than
of failure. That party is in a rage at it-
self and half of mankind on account of
the present unpopularity and
excitation of its opponents.

Everybody hopes for a fair trial of An-
drew Johnson. C. Times.

Then you are evidently nobody.

THE APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATES TO THE CONVENTION.—In the Journal of Friday, a correspondent stated, that, in some of the wards of the city, meetings of the Democratic Club, instead of meet- ings of the Democracy of the wards, had been called to appoint delegates to the City Convention; and he briefly pointed out the inexpediency as well as the in- justice of such a course, adding, what is true, that the course is contrary to the ex- press direction of the call under which the delegates are to be appointed. On this last point we need only cite the fol- lowing extract from the official report of the joint meeting of the Executive Com- mittees of the city and county held on the 25th ultimo:

On motion of W. D. Ray, it was resolved
that each precinct in the county hold a
meeting at their voting place on the 15th
of March at one o'clock P. M., and that
each ward in the city hold a meeting at
7 o'clock P. M. on the same day, to
appoint delegates.

The delegates, it will thus be seen, are
to be appointed not by the Democratic
Club of the respective wards, but by the
Democratic Club of the respective wards,
who are to meet at the club-rooms. The
meetings, though held at the club-rooms,
are to be ward meetings, not club meetings.
The propriety of this is self-evident, the
clubs being organizations within the
city, not the party itself, though we hope
that in point of fact the clubs will soon
include every member of the party. Even
in this case, however, the distinction be-
tween the two should be kept in the
mind, and it is understood that every
Democrat may belong to a club or not
without affecting his membership of the
party. Any attempt to confound the
two would be to set up new and unauthor-
ized tests of Democracy which could not
fail to distract and weaken the party.

We know not whether the statement
of our correspondent is correct or not;
but if it is, we respectfully commend it
to the attention of the club members.
The very strength of our party in
this city makes it imperative that our
proceedings should be regular, for it is
only a strong party that is in danger of
failing by the care over points of form,
and the stronger the party the greater the
danger. We, however, apprehend no diffi-
culty over the point in question. Yet we
have deemed it proper to caution our
friends respecting it.

THE MISSISSIPPI LEVEE COMMISSIONERS
AT WASHINGTON.—A few weeks ago, as
our readers know, Colonel McWhorter and
Major Deaton, of Memphis, came to
Washington, for the purpose of soliciting
government aid for the relief of the
Yazoo basin, and reclaim the land now
desolated in that fertile region. Taking
Louisville on their way, they communi-
cated their purpose to our Board of
Trade, which, it will be remembered,
promptly endorsed it, giving them good-
speed on their mission. We are happy
to know that thus far at least this wish
has been realized.

Scarcely had the Commissioners ar-
rived at Washington, when the telegraph
announced the holding of an advisory
meeting on the subject of their mission
at the rooms of Senator Fowler, of Ten-
nessee, the meeting being numerously at-
tended, among others, by members of
Congress not directly interested in the
work. The agitation thus auspiciously
begun has been prosecuted with vigor
and skill within the last three or four
days bills have been introduced in both
houses of Congress granting the aid so-
licited. Whether or not the bills are likely
soon to pass we cannot say, but we are
encouraged to hope for the best. And we
are encouraged to hope for the best, be-
cause the importance of the
measure, the ability of the Commissioners
to put this importance in a convincing
light, and the success which has already
attended their exertions, warrant us in
looking for the passage of the bills at no
very distant day. We shall look for it
with lively interest. The event is one in
which scarcely less than half of the peo-
ple of the whole Union are directly inter-
ested.

P. S.—Since the article above was in
type, our attention has been called to an
article in the Washington Chronicle, very
cordially advocating the measure to which
we have referred. The article of the
Chronicle is not only just in view and
force in expression but excellent in
spirit. We republish it with great pleas-
ure. It will be found in another column.

OLD Thad Stevens, the radical lead-
er in Congress in the impeachment case,
vehemently and repeatedly asserted last
week in the House, that unless the two
articles of impeachment proposed by
Messrs. Butler and Bingham should be ad-
opted by the House, he would retire to his
home, and therefore could not have any
more in consequence of changes. To be
sure Wade might and do not doubt sign
bills which Johnson vetoes, but it is no
trouble to that body to pass a bill over
Johnson's veto. The proceeding does not
require in any case more than an hour,
whereas the impeachment would require
months. Precisely the same public
measures, while this Congress exists, will
be adopted, whether Johnson or Wade
shall be President, and hence the radicals
are stupid or insane if they do not know
that they are making themselves odious
for nothing and strengthening the power
of their opponents with no conceivable
advantage to themselves.

We should regret the success of im-
peachment as a flagrant national wrong,
we should regret it as a scandal upon our
country in the eyes of mankind, we should
regret it as what might weaken and en-
danger our government by giving a mon-
strous example to posterity; but, looking
only to its effects upon the coming elec-
tion and its inevitable influence upon the
fate of the mischievous party that has
lent up to it, we should not regret it in the
least degree.

IN reply to the statement that the
radical Senators have expressed opinions
in favor of the President's impeachment
and are therefore disqualified to try him,
the radical organs say that the Democrats
have expressed opinions against his
impeachment. What, then, is the point
of the disqualification? What does that
prove, if anything, except that both are
disqualified to try him?

IF the impeachment succeeds, it will
injure the radical party, and de-
cidedly more in the event of success than
of failure. That party is in a rage at it-
self and half of mankind on account of
the present unpopularity and
excitation of its opponents.

Everybody hopes for a fair trial of An-
drew Johnson. C. Times.

Then you are evidently nobody.

THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE U. S. SENATE DECLARING THE ACTION OF THE PRESIDENT IN THE STANTON CASE A VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION, BRINGS TO A PASSAGE OF POLITICAL HISTORY IN GENERAL JACKSON'S TIME. The U. S. Senate pronounced the removal of the Federal deposits from the Bank of the United States a violation of the Constitution. In reply, old Hickory put in a strong and well-remembered pro- test, in which he argued, to the satisfac- tion of the whole powerful party, that, as the Senate was a body appointed to try officials, including himself, upon the pre- sentation of impeachment from the House, its declaration of his guilt in advance was a pre-judgment and an unwarranted as- sumption, disqualifying the Senators to act as judges in case of impeachment. It is well known that he prevailed in the end, and the resolution which he had so successfully expunged from the Senatorial records after a few years in obedience to the national voice.

Whether the members of the Senate
who have just pronounced their opinion
as to the President's guilt in the Stanton
and Thomas matter are or are not techni-
cally disqualified thereby to sit upon his
case, it is at all events exceedingly in-
discreet and grossly indicative for them
to sit. If they consent to do so, they show
themselves unfit to sit in judgment upon
any man or thing. The New York Even-
ing Post, in an article referring to this
case, says: "In the House of Lords, from
which we have borrowed the trial by im-
peachment, it is customary, we believe,
for individual Lords to refuse to partici-
pate in the trial of a peer who has already
declared himself, according to the estab-
lished common law principle that no one
should be a judge or juror in cases
where he has already, or on the merits of
which he has interested, committed himself
decidedly. In pursuance of this prece-
dent, it will be the duty of each Senator
to determine in his own conscience, how
far he may have disqualified himself by
previous acts. Some, however, may be
satisfied as an impartial judge."

(From the National Intelligencer.)
OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE
SENATE, AS A COURT OF IM-
PEACHMENT—OBJECTIONS NOW
TO THE COURT FOR WANT OF
JURISDICTION.—The SENATE
ACTING WITHOUT JURIS-
DICTION MAY NOT THEMSELVES
BE GUILTY OF A HIGH MISDE-
MEANOR.

It is a principle of the common law that
the power of giving names of men as a
judicial tribunal, or a body polit-
ical or corporate, is a right to the
voice and advice of each. Power may be
given to a certain number of men to
part of them; and the whole number ex-
cept one may meet and advise; yet their
act in relation to it is not good if that one
was not duly summoned, and had no legal
notice of the meeting. *Rev. Mr. Mayor*,
in a letter to the *Intelligencer*, dated
March 1st, 1868, says: "I have been
reading the proceedings of the Senate in
the case of *Mr. Stanton*, and I am
satisfied that the Senate is not a
court of impeachment, and that the
President is not a party to the impeach-
ment. The Senate is a body appointed
to try officials, including itself, upon the
presentation of impeachment from the
House, and its declaration of his guilt in
advance is a pre-judgment and an un-
warranted assumption, disqualifying the
Senators to act as judges in case of im-
peachment. It is well known that he
prevailed in the end, and the resolution
which he had so successfully expunged
from the Senatorial records after a few
years in obedience to the national voice."

Whether the members of the Senate
who have just pronounced their opinion
as to the President's guilt in the Stanton
and Thomas matter are or are not techni-
cally disqualified thereby to sit upon his
case, it is at all events exceedingly in-
discreet and grossly indicative for them
to sit. If they consent to do so, they show
themselves unfit to sit in judgment upon
any man or thing. The New York Even-
ing Post, in an article referring to this
case, says: "In the House of Lords, from
which we have borrowed the trial by im-
peachment, it is customary, we believe,
for individual Lords to refuse to partici-
pate in the trial of a peer who has already
declared himself, according to the estab-
lished common law principle that no one
should be a judge or juror in cases
where he has already, or on the merits of
which he has interested, committed himself
decidedly. In pursuance of this prece-
dent, it will be the duty of each Senator
to determine in his own conscience, how
far he may have disqualified himself by
previous acts. Some, however, may be
satisfied as an impartial judge."

(From the National Intelligencer.)
OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE
SENATE, AS A COURT OF IM-
PEACHMENT—OBJECTIONS NOW
TO THE COURT FOR WANT OF
JURISDICTION.—The SENATE
ACTING WITHOUT JURIS-
DICTION MAY NOT THEMSELVES
BE GUILTY OF A HIGH MISDE-
MEANOR.

It is a principle of the common law that
the power of giving names of men as a
judicial tribunal, or a body polit-
ical or corporate, is a right to the
voice and advice of each. Power may be
given to a certain number of men to
part of them; and the whole number ex-
cept one may meet and advise; yet their
act in relation to it is not good if that one
was not duly summoned, and had no legal
notice of the meeting. *Rev. Mr. Mayor*,
in a letter to the *Intelligencer*, dated
March 1st, 1868, says: "I have been
reading the proceedings of the Senate in
the case of *Mr. Stanton*, and I am
satisfied that the Senate is not a
court of impeachment, and that the
President is not a party to the impeach-
ment. The Senate is a body appointed
to try officials, including itself, upon the
presentation of impeachment from the
House, and its declaration of his guilt in
advance is a pre-judgment and an un-
warranted assumption, disqualifying the
Senators to act as judges in case of im-
peachment. It is well known that he
prevailed in the end, and the resolution
which he had so successfully expunged
from the Senatorial records after a few
years in obedience to the national voice."

Whether the members of the Senate
who have just pronounced their opinion
as to the President's guilt in the Stanton
and Thomas matter are or are not techni-
cally disqualified thereby to sit upon his
case, it is at all events exceedingly in-
discreet and grossly indicative for them
to sit. If they consent to do so, they show
themselves unfit to sit in judgment upon
any man or thing. The New York Even-
ing Post, in an article referring to this
case, says: "In the House of Lords, from
which we have borrowed the trial by im-
peachment, it is customary, we believe,
for individual Lords to refuse to partici-
pate in the trial of a peer who has already
declared himself, according to the estab-
lished common law principle that no one
should be a judge or juror in cases
where he has already, or on the merits of
which he has interested, committed himself
decidedly. In pursuance of this prece-
dent, it will be the duty of each Senator
to determine in his own conscience, how
far he may have disqualified himself by
previous acts. Some, however, may be
satisfied as an impartial judge."

(From the National Intelligencer.)
OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE
SENATE, AS A COURT OF IM-
PEACHMENT—OBJECTIONS NOW
TO THE COURT FOR WANT OF
JURISDICTION.—The SENATE
ACTING WITHOUT JURIS-
DICTION MAY NOT THEMSELVES
BE GUILTY OF A HIGH MISDE-
MEANOR.

It is a principle of the common law that
the power of giving names of men as a
judicial tribunal, or a body polit-
ical or corporate, is a right to the
voice and advice of each. Power may be
given to a certain number of men to
part of them; and the whole number ex-
cept one may meet and advise; yet their
act in relation to it is not good if that one
was not duly summoned, and had no legal
notice of the meeting. *Rev. Mr. Mayor*,
in a letter to the *Intelligencer*, dated
March 1st, 1868, says: "I have been
reading the proceedings of the Senate in
the case of *Mr. Stanton*, and I am
satisfied that the Senate is not a
court of impeachment, and that the
President is not a party to the impeach-
ment. The Senate is a body appointed
to try officials, including itself, upon the
presentation of impeachment from the
House, and its declaration of his guilt in
advance is a pre-judgment and an un-
warranted assumption, disqualifying the
Senators to act as judges in case of im-
peachment. It is well known that he
prevailed in the end, and the resolution
which he had so successfully expunged
from the Senatorial records after a few
years in obedience to the national voice."

Whether the members of the Senate
who have just pronounced their opinion
as to the President's guilt in the Stanton
and Thomas matter are or are not techni-
cally disqualified thereby to sit upon his
case, it is at all events exceedingly in-
discreet and grossly indicative for them
to sit. If they consent to do so, they show
themselves unfit to sit in judgment upon
any man or thing. The New York Even-
ing Post, in an article referring to this
case, says: "In the House of Lords, from
which we have borrowed the trial by im-
peachment, it is customary, we believe,
for individual Lords to refuse to partici-
pate in the trial of a peer who has already
declared himself, according to the estab-
lished common law principle that no one
should be a judge or juror in cases
where he has already, or on the merits of
which he has interested, committed himself
decidedly. In pursuance of this prece-
dent, it will be the duty of each Senator
to determine in his own conscience, how
far he may have disqualified himself by
previous acts. Some, however, may be
satisfied as an impartial judge."

(From the National Intelligencer.)
OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE
SENATE, AS A COURT OF IM-
PEACHMENT—OBJECTIONS NOW
TO THE COURT FOR WANT OF
JURISDICTION.—The SENATE
ACTING WITHOUT JURIS-
DICTION MAY NOT THEMSELVES
BE GUILTY OF A HIGH MISDE-
MEANOR.

It is a principle of the common law that
the power of giving names of men as a
judicial tribunal, or a body polit-
ical or corporate, is a right to the
voice and advice of each. Power may be
given to a certain number of men to
part of them; and the whole number ex-
cept one may meet and advise; yet their
act in relation to it is not good if that one
was not duly summoned, and had no legal
notice of the meeting. *Rev. Mr. Mayor*,
in a letter to the *Intelligencer*, dated
March 1st, 1868, says: "I have been
reading the proceedings of the Senate in
the case of *Mr. Stanton*, and I am
satisfied that the Senate is not a
court of impeachment, and that the
President is not a party to the impeach-
ment. The Senate is a body appointed
to try officials, including itself, upon the
presentation of impeachment from the
House, and its declaration of his guilt in
advance is a pre-judgment and an un-
warranted assumption, disqualifying the
Senators to act as judges in case of im-
peachment. It is well known that he
prevailed in the end, and the resolution
which he had so successfully expunged
from the Senatorial records after a few
years in obedience to the national voice."

Whether the members of the Senate
who have just pronounced their opinion
as to the President's guilt in the Stanton
and Thomas matter are or are not techni-
cally disqualified thereby to sit upon his
case, it is at all events exceedingly in-
discreet and grossly indicative for them
to sit. If they consent to do so, they show
themselves unfit to sit in judgment upon
any man or thing. The New York Even-
ing Post, in an article referring to this
case, says: "In the House of Lords, from
which we have borrowed the trial by im-
peachment, it is customary, we believe,
for individual Lords to refuse to partici-
pate in the trial of a peer who has already
declared himself, according to the estab-
lished common law principle that no one
should be a judge or juror in cases
where he has already, or on the merits of
which he has interested, committed himself
decidedly. In pursuance of this prece-
dent, it will be the duty of each Senator
to determine in his own conscience, how
far he may have disqualified himself by
previous acts. Some, however, may be
satisfied as an impartial judge."

(From the National Intelligencer.)
OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE
SENATE, AS A COURT OF IM-
PEACHMENT—OBJECTIONS NOW
TO THE COURT FOR WANT OF
JURISDICTION.—The SENATE
ACTING WITHOUT JURIS-
DICTION MAY NOT THEMSELVES
BE GUILTY OF A HIGH MISDE-
MEANOR.

It is a principle of the common law that
the power of giving names of men as a
judicial tribunal, or a body polit-
ical or corporate, is a right to the
voice and advice of each. Power may be
given to a certain number of men to
part of them; and the whole number ex-
cept one may meet and advise; yet their
act in relation to it is not good if that one
was not duly summoned, and had no legal
notice of the meeting. *Rev. Mr. Mayor*,
in a letter to the *Intelligencer*, dated
March 1st, 1868, says: "I have been
reading the proceedings of the Senate in
the case of *Mr. Stanton*, and I am
satisfied that the Senate is not a
court of impeachment, and that the
President is not a party to the impeach-
ment. The Senate is a body appointed
to try officials, including itself, upon the
presentation of impeachment from the
House, and its declaration of his guilt in
advance is a pre-judgment and an un-
warranted assumption, disqualifying the
Senators to act as judges in case of im-
peachment. It is well known that he
prevailed in the end, and the resolution
which he had so successfully expunged
from the Senatorial records after a few
years in obedience to the national voice."

Whether the members of the Senate
who have just pronounced their opinion
as to the President's guilt in the Stanton
and Thomas matter are or are not techni-
cally disqualified thereby to sit upon his
case, it is at all events exceedingly in-
discreet and grossly indicative for them
to sit. If they consent to do so, they show
themselves unfit to sit in judgment upon
any man or thing. The New York Even-
ing Post, in an article referring to this
case, says: "In the House of Lords, from
which we have borrowed the trial by im-
peachment, it is customary, we believe,
for individual Lords to refuse to partici-
pate in the trial of a peer who has already
declared himself, according to the estab-
lished common law principle that no one
should be a judge or juror in cases
where he has already, or on the merits of
which he has interested, committed himself
decidedly. In pursuance of this prece-
dent, it will be the duty of each Senator
to determine in his own conscience, how
far he may have disqualified himself by
previous acts. Some, however, may be
satisfied as an impartial judge."

(From the National Intelligencer.)
OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE
SENATE, AS A COURT OF IM-
PEACHMENT—OBJECTIONS NOW
TO THE COURT FOR WANT OF
JURISDICTION.—The SENATE
ACTING WITHOUT JURIS-
DICTION MAY NOT THEMSELVES
BE GUILTY OF A HIGH MISDE-
MEANOR.

It is a principle of the common law that
the power of giving names of men as a
judicial tribunal, or a body polit-
ical or corporate, is a right to the
voice and advice of each. Power may be
given to a certain number of men to
part of them; and the whole number ex-
cept one may meet and advise; yet their
act in relation to it is not good if that one
was not duly summoned, and had no legal
notice of the meeting. *Rev. Mr. Mayor*,
in a letter to the *Intelligencer*, dated
March 1st, 1868, says: "I have been
reading the proceedings of the Senate in
the case of *Mr. Stanton*, and I am
satisfied that the Senate is not a
court of impeachment, and that the
President is not a party to the impeach-
ment. The Senate is a body appointed
to try officials, including itself, upon the
presentation of impeachment from the
House, and its declaration of his guilt in
advance is a pre-judgment and an un-
warranted assumption, disqualifying the
Senators to act as judges in case of im-
peachment. It is well known that he
prevailed in the end, and the resolution
which he had so successfully expunged
from the Senatorial records after a few
years in obedience to the national voice."

Whether the members of the Senate
who have just pronounced their opinion
as to the President's guilt in the Stanton
and Thomas matter are or are not techni-
cally disqualified thereby to sit upon his
case, it is at all events exceedingly in-
discreet and grossly indicative for them
to sit. If they consent to do so, they show
themselves unfit to sit in judgment upon
any man or thing. The New York Even-
ing Post, in an article referring to this
case, says: "In the House of Lords, from
which we have borrowed the trial by im-
peachment, it is customary, we believe,
for individual Lords to refuse to partici-
pate in the trial of a peer who has already
declared himself, according to the estab-
lished common law principle that no one
should be a judge or juror in cases
where he has already, or on the merits of
which he has interested, committed himself
decidedly. In pursuance of this prece-
dent, it will be the duty of each Senator
to determine in his own conscience, how
far he may have disqualified himself by
previous acts. Some, however, may be
satisfied as an impartial judge."

(From the National Intelligencer.)
OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE
SENATE, AS A COURT OF IM-
PEACHMENT—OBJECTIONS NOW
TO THE COURT FOR WANT OF
JURISDICTION.—The SENATE
ACTING WITHOUT JURIS-
DICTION MAY NOT THEMSELVES
BE GUILTY OF A HIGH MISDE-
MEANOR.

It is a principle of the common law that
the power of giving names of men as a
judicial tribunal, or a body polit-
ical or corporate, is a right to the
voice and advice of each. Power may be
given to a certain number of men to
part of them; and the whole number ex-
cept one may meet and advise; yet their
act in relation to it is not good if that one
was not duly summoned, and had no legal
notice of the meeting. *Rev. Mr. Mayor*,
in a letter to the *Intelligencer*, dated
March 1st, 1868, says: "I have been
reading the proceedings of the Senate in
the case of *Mr. Stanton*, and I am
satisfied that the Senate is not a
court of impeachment, and that the
President is not a party to the impeach-
ment. The Senate is a body appointed
to try officials, including itself, upon the
presentation of impeachment from the
House, and its declaration of his guilt in
advance is a pre-judgment and an un-
warranted assumption, disqualifying the
Senators to act as judges in case of im-
peachment. It is well known that he
prevailed in the end, and the resolution
which he had so successfully expunged
from the Senatorial records after a few
years in obedience to the national voice."

Whether the members of the Senate
who have just pronounced their opinion
as to the President's guilt in the Stanton
and Thomas matter are or are not techni-
cally disqualified thereby to sit upon his
case, it is at all events exceedingly in-
discreet and grossly indicative for them
to sit. If they consent to do so, they show
themselves unfit to sit in judgment upon
any man or thing. The New York Even-
ing Post, in an article referring to this
case, says: "In the House of Lords, from
which we have borrowed the trial by im-
peachment, it is customary, we believe,
for individual Lords to refuse to partici-
pate in the trial of a peer who has already
declared himself, according to the estab-
lished common law principle that no one
should be a judge or juror in cases
where he has already, or on the merits of
which he has interested, committed himself
decidedly. In pursuance of this prece-
dent, it will be the duty of each Senator
to determine in his own conscience, how
far he may have disqualified himself by
previous acts. Some, however, may be
satisfied as an impartial judge."

(From the National Intelligencer.)
OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE
SENATE, AS A COURT OF IM-
PEACHMENT—OBJECTIONS NOW
TO THE COURT FOR WANT OF
JURISDICTION.—The SENATE
ACTING WITHOUT JURIS-
DICTION MAY NOT THEMSELVES
BE GUILTY OF A HIGH MISDE-
MEANOR.

It is a principle of the common law that
the power of giving names of men as a
judicial tribunal, or a body polit-
ical or corporate, is a right to the
voice and advice of each. Power may be
given to a certain number of men to
part of them; and the whole number ex-
cept one may meet and advise; yet their
act in relation to it is not good if that one
was not duly summoned, and had no legal
notice of the meeting. *Rev. Mr. Mayor*,
in a letter to the *Intelligencer*, dated
March 1st, 1868, says: "I have been
reading the proceedings of the Senate in
the case of *Mr. Stanton*, and I am
satisfied that the Senate is not a
court of impeachment, and that the
President is not a party to the impeach-
ment. The Senate is a body appointed
to try officials, including itself, upon the
presentation of impeachment from the
House, and its declaration of his guilt in
advance is a pre-judgment and an un-
warranted assumption, disqualifying the
Senators to act as judges in case of im-
peachment. It is well known that he
prevailed in the end, and the resolution
which he had so successfully expunged
from the Senatorial records after a few
years in obedience to the national voice."

Whether the members of the Senate
who have just pronounced their opinion
as to the President's guilt in the Stanton
and Thomas matter are or are not techni-
cally disqualified thereby to sit upon his
case, it is at all events exceedingly in-
discreet and grossly indicative for them
to sit. If they consent to do so, they show
themselves unfit to sit in judgment upon
any man or thing. The New York Even-
ing Post, in an article referring to this
case, says: "In the House of Lords, from
which we have borrowed the trial by im-
peachment, it is customary, we believe,
for individual Lords to refuse to partici-
pate in the trial of a peer who has already
declared himself, according to the estab-
lished common law principle that no one
should be a judge or juror in cases
where he has already, or on the merits of
which he has interested, committed himself
decidedly. In pursuance of this prece-
dent, it will be the duty of each Senator
to determine in his own conscience, how
far he may have disqualified himself by
previous acts. Some, however, may be
satisfied as an impartial judge."

(From the National Intelligencer.)
OF THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE
SENATE, AS A COURT OF IM-
PEACHMENT—OBJECTIONS NOW
TO THE COURT FOR WANT OF
JURISDICTION.—The SENATE
ACTING WITHOUT JURIS-
DICTION MAY NOT THEMSELVES
BE GUILTY OF A HIGH MISDE-
MEANOR.

It is a principle of the common law that
the power of giving names of men as a
judicial tribunal, or a body polit-
ical or corporate, is a right to the
voice and advice of each. Power may be
given to a certain number of men to
part of them; and the whole number ex-
cept one may meet and advise; yet their
act in relation to it is not good if that one
was not duly summoned, and had no legal
notice of the meeting. *Rev. Mr. Mayor*,
in a letter to the *Intelligencer*, dated
March 1st, 1868, says: "I have been
reading the proceedings of the Senate in
the case of *Mr. Stanton*, and I am
satisfied that the Senate is not a
court of impeachment, and that the
President is not a party to the impeach-
ment. The Senate is a body appointed
to try officials, including itself, upon the
presentation of impeachment from the
House, and its declaration of his guilt in
advance is a pre-judgment and an un-
warranted assumption, disqualifying the
Senators to act as judges in case of im-
peachment

